

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 94 11:59:17 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #605
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Wed, 1 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 605

Today's Topics:

 "for ID" (2 msgs)
 440 in So. Cal. (2 msgs)
 Ham Radio & More Station List 6/1/94
 Internet/Packet
 Mt. Equinox Vermont special event station
 N7RO QSL bureau
 need NYC repeater freq
 QSL bureaux, N7RO

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 17:11:52 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!sgiblab!netkeeper.sj.nec.com!vivaldi!rsd0!
usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: "for ID"
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994May31.174253.22865@tellab5.tellabs.com> jwa@tellabs.com (John
Albert) writes:
>In article <CqFnt4.Bn9@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey
Herman) writes:
>
>
>>
>>That's done so that their VOX continues to key the xmtr; otherwise at
>>every pause their xmtr would drop off and you'd miss the first syllable

>>(at least in the older gear) of their next spoken word.

>>

>>Jeff NH6IL

>>

>

>But I hear it on two meters!

Ahhhhh Ummmmm Uhhhhhhh my two meter uhhhhh radio ehrrrr has VOX.

dave

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 18:29:11 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.service.uci.edu!ttinews!avatar!sorgatz@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: "for ID"

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun1.171152.23879@rsd.dl.nec.com> dave@rsd.dl.nec.com (Dave Rogers) writes:

>In article <1994May31.174253.22865@tellab5.tellabs.com> jwa@tellabs.com (John Albert) writes:

>>In article <CqFnt4.Bn9@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>

>>

>>>

>>>That's done so that their VOX continues to key the xmtr; otherwise at
>>>every pause their xmtr would drop off and you'd miss the first syllable
>>>(at least in the older gear) of their next spoken word.

>>>

>>>Jeff NH6IL

>>>

>>

>>But I hear it on two meters!

>

>Ahhhhh Ummmmm Uhhhhhhh my two meter uhhhhh radio ehrrrr has VOX.

>

>dave

>

I always threatened to invent an 'uuuuuhhhmmm" cancelling microphone, with DSP it might even be possible! ...just reinsert a subaudible tone to keep that relay down and presto! Heh..

-Avatar-> (aka: Erik K. Sorgatz) KB6LUY

TTI(es@soldev.tti.com)or: sorgatz@avatar.tti.com *Government produces NOTHING!*

3100 Ocean Park Blvd. Santa Monica, CA 90405

+-----+

+-----+

(OPINIONS EXPRESSED DO NOT REFLECT THE VIEWS OF CITICORP OR ITS MANAGEMENT!)

Date: 1 Jun 1994 16:51:10 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!netline-fddi.jpl.nasa.gov!sec396-
news.jpl.nasa.gov!news@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <rogjdCqpCto.6B6@netcom.com> rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

>That's right Dick, OB. 99% of the amateurs in Southern California are the
>have nots, and the good old boys who have assigned themselves pretty much
>all of 440 are the haves. And I'm for throwing them out...you have that
>quite right.

>

>It's a scandal. I mean, there is practically no point in owning a dual
>band (2m/440) rig in Southern California. Maybe back in the old days,
>when 440 was exotic and little used, except by pioneers, it made sense to
>give it away to a few guys. But in this crowded time, with hundreds of
>new hams getting VHF privileges every month, it makes no sense at all.

>

>The contrast between the wholesome and well-wrought band plan on 2 meters
>with the desolate desert of 440 in Southern California is stark. It cries
>out for correction.

I wouldn't call the 2 meter plan all that wholesome or well-wrought, it is just different and has existed for a longer period of time. Looking at what has happened to the 440 band and somewhat to the 220 band was that originally, there was a group of people who wanted to experiment with far reaching linked repeater systems. Unable to do so on 2 meters, because the band was already full, they move to another band where they developed their systems. At great expense to say the least because cheap HAM equipment was not available for these bands. Now, that 2 meters has become even more congested, people are looking to more fertile landscape, only to find that it is already occupied. (sounds a bit like the settlers verses the indians.) They talk of outlawing the systems that are present. Restricting what they can do. (Move the closed systems off to the reservations.) Jeez, people never learn.

20 years ago, the JPL Amateur Radio Club wanted to put up a 2 meter repeater and a 220 repeater. We were told that there was no place for us to go on 2M, so the co-ordinating body gave us two 220 repeater pairs. One we made open, the other private. We were one of a few organizations supporting 220. Now that spectrum has become scarce, the whiners are saying, "How come JPL gets two 220 freqs when the band is crowded? Whaaa, Whaaa, Whaaa." Ah, so much for being a pioneer. (By the way, we have since adopted the policy of allowing non-club members to use the private repeater even though it will

continue to listed as a private repeater.)

Randy Hammock KC6HUR
hammock@kelvin.jpl.nasa.gov

Date: 01 Jun 1994 17:23:49 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!news.cac.psu.edu!news.pop.psu.edu!
psuvax1!news.cc.swarthmore.edu!netnews.upenn.edu!netnews.upenn.edu!
yee@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

>That's a moot point. 400 as a haven for closed systems was acceptable
>as late as 1979 when I first ventured up there, but its not acceptable
>any more! We have to adapt to the greater good.

Wrong! This is about as dangerous an attitude as ANY I have heard on
USENET. Let me explain with an analogy. "The US as a haven for
private homes was acceptable as late as 1994 when I last visited the
US. Its not acceptable any more due to the vast amount of
homelessness in the world. We have to adapt to the greater good.
Every homeowner shall be required to house as many homeless as
possible."

Closed repeater systems are private property. It can not be
confiscated "for the common good." TANSTAAFL. If you want an open
system, put it up yourself. The problem, of course, is that there is
only so much spectrum to spread around. A closed system uses up
spectrum and deprives the vast majority of hams access to this
spectrum. Since this spectrum is meant as a "public park," there is
something amiss when most of a band is populated by closed repeaters
that are rarely in use. By analogy, this is like taking Yellowstone
and partitioning it out to individuals as private fiefdoms. Highly
active closed repeaters are not the problem as this indicates that the
spectrum is in use. Closed repeaters that are rarely in use waste
spectrum. Why can't such repeaters be shunted to a single frequency
pair with different PL offsets? Open repeaters are open to one and
all so there should be plenty of users all the time. Closed repeaters
could share frequency pairs. Thus, the interests of all can be well
served.

--

Medical Image Processing Group		73 de Conway Yee, N2JWQ
411 Blockley Hall		EMAIL : yee@mipg.upenn.edu
423 Guardian Drive		TELEPHONE : 1 (215) 662-6780

Philadelphia, PA 19104-6021 (USA) | FAX : 1 (215) 898-9145

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 08:27:07
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!udel!news2.sprintlink.net!
news.sprintlink.net!indirect.com!s146.phxslip.indirect.com!
lenwink@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Ham Radio & More Station List 6/1/94
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I have been asked by e-mail by many for this list. The list can change at any time. Ham Radio & More is a national listener call-in show, hosted by Len Winkler, KB7LPW. It has aired on the originating station, KFNN, 1510AM, in Phoenix, Az. since 4/21/91. The show has been on the Talk America Network since 11/28/93. The show is on every Sunday at 6:00pm EST. There are guests each week, prize give-a-ways, listener calls, trivia, and more. It's mostly non-heavily technical, and more about the aspects involved in amateur radio, and who is doing what. In addition to the following stations, the show can be heard via satellite on Spacenet 3, Transponder 9, 6.8 audio.

Hartselle, Al. WHRT, 860am
Decatur, Al. WAJF, 1490am
Phoenix, Az. KFNN, 1510am
Big Bear, Ca. KTOT, 101.7fm
Denver/Boulder, Co. KBCO, 1190am
Hartford/Newington, Ct. WATR, 1320am
Chicago, Il. WKTA, 1330am (tape delay)
Alton, Il. WBGZ, 1570am
South Bend, In. WIWO, 1580am (tape delay)
Huntington, In. WPDJ, 1300am
Orleans, Ma. WKPE, 1170am
Boston, Ma. WSSH, 1510am (50,000 WATTS)
St. Louis, Mo. WBGZ, 1570am
Biloxi, Ms. WVMJ, 570am
Fayetteville, Nc. WEEB, 990am
Raleigh, Nc. WCRY, 1460am
Lincoln/Hastings, Ne. KICS, 1550am
Philadelphia, Pa. WIFI, 1460am
Oklahoma City, Ok. WKY, 930am

Any radio station can air the show at absolutely no charge, no contract. Call KFNN, 1510am, for clock information and other details at 602-241-1510.
To get the show aired in your city, have your fellow hams call a local small talk station and tell the program director to air the show. Sending a few FAX's helps, too.

Thanks again & 73,

Len, KB7LPW

Date: 31 May 1994 23:31:22 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!proto.ida.org!bah.com!bah.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Internet/Packet
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

There is a "live" Internet/Packet gateway in tyhe Midwest,
michigan (I think) that you can telnet to and get onto
packet (ampr.org) and join the "chat-chit". Anyone
know what the IP is for it?

Date: 1 Jun 1994 13:57:42 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!xap!
usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Mt. Equinox Vermont special event station
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

The Wellesley (MA) ARS will operate W1TKZ on HF/VHF/UHF from Mt. Equinox
in southern Vermont in the weekend of June 11/12. This is a great chance
to add Vermont to your WAS list, or add FN33 to your VUCC grid totals.
Because of the date change for this year's ARRL June VHF QSO Party, we
will *not* be participating in that event, so if you were counting on
the contest to find us for FN33 or Vt, look for us instead on the
traditional second weekend in June.

Our Mt. Equinox station will be operated in conjunction with the annual
vintage car race up the Mount Equinox auto road. We plan be on the air
from 1100Z to 1800Z June 11 and 0500Z to 1200Z June 12. VHF/UHF operation
will be SSB/CW on 50.160 144.210 432.110 and FM on 146.55 and 446.00.
HF operation will be in the lower portions of the General phone and CW
subbands on 80-12m and the Novice phone and CW subbands. QSL to the
Wellesley ARS, 200H Linden St., Wellesley, MA 02181-7913.

We're hoping for some good VHF/UHF openings and good HF band conditions!

73,
Scott W01G, Vice President, Wellesley Amateur Radio Society

Scott Sminkey email: sasminkey@eng.xyplex.com
Software Sustaining Engineering voice: 508 952-4792
Xyplex, Inc. fax: 508 952-4887
295 Foster St. (Opinions, comments, etc. are mine,
Littleton, MA 01460 not Xyplex's...)

Date: 1 Jun 1994 18:03:44 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!gerald@cc.utexas.edu!
astro.as.utexas.edu!oo7@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: N7R0 QSL bureau
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

barry@w2up.wells.com (Barry Kutner) says:

>oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:

>> It's not so much for "those DX who aren't reachable through the
>> bureaus", as it is for DXers who are too lazy to find out the
>> managers of DX stations they work, or who don't work much DX anyway.

>Derek - Laziness has nothing to do with it. Personally, I only chase
>Mixed and RTTY DXCC. If I work some other modes or some bands, I'll use
>N7R0 cuz I don't want to spend the money on cards I not really chasing,
>but want cuz some day I may change my mind.

Sure, but if you are an ARRL member and you work HC8N you can
send me a card via the bureau and you'll get one back. If you
don't know who the manager is you can send it via N7R0, who will
then send it to me, I send it back to him and he sends it to you.
The main difference is that you paid him to find out who HC8N's
manager is. But, as I said, there are other reasons for using
someone like N7R0.

>It's not too bad for stateside mgrs, but for the DX mgrs, you're talking
>\$1-2/card rather than about 20 cents.

Sure, no argument with that. I suppose N7R0 sends to overseas
managers, I don't really know. Again, you could reach that same
manager yourself via the bureau. If the manager doesn't reply
to bureau cards, he's probably not going to reply to a stack of
100 cards that N7R0 sends, either.

>Personally, I'm not thrilled with the response rate thru R0. I remember
>15-20 years ago when Jesse, W3KT did it, and seemed to have a much better
>response rate.

Much of the responsibility lies with the managers. I don't have to reply to the cards N7RO sends me, he doesn't pay me a cent for doing it, and it costs me the price of the cards. But responsible managers reply to all cards.

I suppose it could be that N7RO doesn't keep up with the manager lists as well as W3KT did, but I've no evidence that this is so.

Maybe it's just the times, when there are pigs/thieves
>like F6FNU and DJ6SI who want "tips" for their troubles...

DJ6SI is not a QSL manager, he goes on DXpeditions to places that are semi-rare to rare. He then replies to QSL cards that people send him. I don't know what the minimum is you can get away with and get a card from him, you need to send \$2 for the Germany --> USA mailing costs, and I have sent him \$3 in the past and had cards back. The rarer the place he goes to, the more I contribute. He doesn't answer bureau cards, and he doesn't keep his logs open for more than a few months, but I can live with that.

F6FNU is only a manager, not a DXpeditioner, and I think he has reformed somewhat (at one time his cards were not counted for the French awards, not sure if that is true now). He replies promptly, and I believe he will send a card if you send him only \$1. Again, if I want a card for a new country, I don't mind sending \$2 a time. You can confirm a couple of hundred countries via the bureau, and spending a total of \$250 confirming the other 120 or so is peanuts compared with the hours you put in working them, or the equipment you use to work them.

So I really wouldn't call said people pigs or thieves, especially when they go on DXpeditions to countries that we need. I have had essentially 100% returns for direct cards over the years, thanks to a lot of responsible DXers and managers. I've never used N7RO, but I wouldn't discourage anyone from using any method of getting QSL cards if that is their goal. Happy DXing!

Derek Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)
Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,
Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)
oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

Date: 31 May 1994 23:15:05 -0400

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!
proto.ida.org!bah.com!bah.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: need NYC repeater freq
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Try 145.39, minus, open. I've heard it's on the Empire state
building. It's readable in Southern Maryland any rate.

If you get into Western Connecticut try 147.12 plus, 141.3 PL.

Date: Wed, 01 Jun 94 13:40:05 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.duke.edu!godot.cc.duq.edu!
newsfeed.pitt.edu!dsinc!wells!w2up!barry@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: QSL bureaux, N7RO
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:

> It's not so much for "those DX who aren't reachable through the
> bureaux", as it is for DXers who are too lazy to find out the
> managers of DX stations they work, or who don't work much DX anyway.
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Derek Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)
> Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,
> Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)
> oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

Derek - Laziness has nothing to do with it. Personally, I only chase
Mixed and RTTY DXCC. If I work some other modes or some bands, I'll use
N7RO cuz I don't want to spend the money on cards I not really chasing,
but want cuz some day I may change my mind.

It's not too bad for stateside mgrs, but for the DX mgrs, you're talking
\$1-2/card rather than about 20 cents.

Even when I send cards thru N7RO I write the mgr's call on the back, to
make it easier for him.

Personally, I'm not thrilled with the response rate thru RO. I remember
15-20 years ago when Jesse, W3KT did it, and seemed to have a much better
response rate. Maybe it's just the times, when there are pigs/thieves
like F6FNU and DJ6SI who want "tips" for their troubles...

73 Barry

```
=====
Barry N. Kutner, W2UP      Usenet/Internet: barry@w2up.wells.com
Newtown, PA              Packet Radio: W2UP @ WB3JOE.#EPA.PA.USA.NA
                          Packet Cluster: W2UP >K2TW (FRC)
.....
-----
```

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 15:59:05 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
rogjd@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2sfhir\$r4g@tymix.Tymnet.COM>, <2sh2lq\$b77@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>,
<2shtbu\$d8o@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Jim Reese (jreese@sugar.NeoSoft.COM) wrote:

: But what about the "closed" systems that have many users? They do exist. You
: can't simply say "throw out all closed systems". It just doesn't work. There
: may well be a need for reform in SoCal, but the band belongs to the owners of
: closed systems just as it belongs to those who want every system to be open.

Agreed, the closed repeater owners would have the same rights as the rest
of us. They simply wouldn't have rights over and above the rest of us,
namely, coordination for a repeater pair on a closed or private basis.

Once 440 reached the level of openness found on the model band, 2 meters,
perhaps this could be relaxed.

The current 440 coordination group has abused its authority recklessly.
This can be seen quite clearly by the disuse into which Southern Cal's
440 band has degenerated.

: As a frequency coordinator, you must look at both sides of the issue. Many of
: the closed systems have been operating for long periods of time without causing
: problems. A coordinator just can't say "Well, we've changed our policies, and
: you have to go". They'll get their butts sued off.

: The "paper" radios should be decoordinated. There's no coordinator worth his
: salt who will disagree with this, but you can't expect any coordinator to just
: see one side of the issue.

True, but the ones in Southern Cal are happy with the paper radios. If

not, then why are they coordinated?

: --
: Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Real Texans don't let the truth get in
: jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | the way of a good story."
: --

rogjd@netcom.com
Glendale, CA
AB6WR

Date: 1 Jun 1994 09:29:52 -0700
From: btree.brooktree.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2sfhir\$r4g@tymix.Tymnet.COM>, <rogjdCqpCto.6B6@netcom.com>,
<2si4ff\$q06@tymix.tymnet.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <2si4ff\$q06@tymix.tymnet.com>,
Dick Flanagan <flanagan@niagara.Tymnet.COM> wrote:

>
>Those "good old boys" were properly and legitimately coordinated when a lot
>of the sabre-rattling crowd were still in diapers. How long before the next
>Revolution Of The Have Nots throws out =your= "coordinated" repeaters?!? How
>do you protect =your= repeaters from the next batch of frequency grabbers?

That's a moot point. 400 as a haven for closed systems was acceptable as late
as 1979 when I first ventured up there, but its not acceptable any more!
We have to adapt to the greater good.

If a majority of hams are no-codes and want open repeaters up there, they will
eventually get it! The times they are a changing...
We should replace it all with spread-spectrum stuff soon anyway :-)

Roger Bly

--

Roger Bly
roger@brooktree.com

Date: 1 Jun 1994 17:41:21 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU!kennish@network.ucsd.edu

References <2sfhir\$r4g@tymix.Tymnet.COM>, <2sh2lq\$b77@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>,
<1994Jun1.155833.11624@newsgate.sps.mot.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

```
>
> Oh ooooo here he goes again.....
>
> In the finest tradition of stirring things up, I would like to suggest
>the following. In areas where demand exceeds available spectrum, frequency
>coordinations should be distributed on a lottery basis, and with limited
>terms. I would propose that terms be limited to ten years, long enough
>to obtain an adequate return on the equipment investment, and short
>
>~~~~~
```

Since when was Amateur Radio a Financial Investment? I think you ought to re read Part 97 a few times..... There are many repeaters whose owners will never recoup the costs of keeping the repeater going. It isn't the goal to make money -- the goal is to have fun. The best systems are the ones that have been around for a while, since they have had time to get things working right. Yanking the coordination after 10 years is stupid -- nobody will want to make a long term investment of time and effort and their own money. This is the same kind of short term thinking that is getting the American economy's ass kicked around the world. Great.

I've been told to look at 1280, and when the time comes, that's where I will look.

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 15:58:33 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!dtsdev0!kinzer@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2seid0\$702@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>, <2sfhir\$r4g@tymix.Tymnet.COM>,
<2sh2lq\$b77@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>gat
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Oh ooooo here he goes again.....

In the finest tradition of stirring things up, I would like to suggest the following. In areas where demand exceeds available spectrum, frequency coordinations should be distributed on a lottery basis, and with limited terms. I would propose that terms be limited to ten years, long enough to obtain an adequate return on the equipment investment, and short enough to allow the changing demands of the hobby to be reflected in the band utilization.

I personally suspect that the private groups would do better than open ones in this matter, since the groups would probably be applying in mass for the coordination. It would, however, allow for some turnover in repeater usage.

Some rules for fairness in applications would need to be implemented.

-dave

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #605
